

BRIAN HAROLD LOGAN,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
vs.  
  
NANCY A. BERRYHILL,  
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,  
  
Defendant.

---

Plaintiff, Brian Harold Logan, brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) to obtain judicial review of the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration's (Defendant's) final decision denying his claim for disability insurance benefits. This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (the Report) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, to whom this case was assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a), (D.S.C.). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that this Court reverse Defendant's decision and remand the case for further administrative action. ECF No. 17. Defendant filed a notice, ECF No. 19, stating that there are no objections to the Report, and this matter is now ripe for decision.

The Court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained therein. 28 U.S.C. § 636. However, in the absence of objections to the Report, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a case, “a district

court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

In light of this standard, the Court has carefully reviewed the Report, the relevant filings, and the applicable law. Having found no clear error by the Magistrate Judge on the face of the record or in the Report, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, ECF No. 17, is **ACCEPTED**. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the Commissioner’s decision is **REVERSED**, and this matter is **REMANDED** for further proceedings, as discussed in the Report and the Order.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

*s/ Terry L. Wooten*

Terry L. Wooten

Senior United States District Judge

May 8, 2019

Columbia, South Carolina